REMARKS

This Response is submitted in response to the outstanding Office Action, dated February 13, 2007. Claims 11-13 were cancelled in the Amendment and Response to Office Action dated July 14, 2006. Claims 1-10 and 14-21 are presently pending in the above-identified patent application.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 10, and 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Metze (United States Patent No. 5,754,948) in view of Larrick et al. (United States Patent No. 6,690,741). In addition, the Examiner rejected claims 3 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Metze in view of Larrick et al. and further in view of Cheung et al. (United States Patent No. 6,577,157). Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Metze in view of Larrick et al. and further in view of Nozawa et al. (United States Patent No. 6,942,157). Claims 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Metze in view of Larrick et al. and further in view of Ghaem (United States Patent No. 5,335,361).

Independent Claims 1, 14 and 17

Independent claims 1, 14 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Metze in view of Larrick et al. The Examiner asserts that Metze teaches a method for wireless communication among first and second integrated circuit devices 16 within an enclosure 12, said method comprising the steps of: transmitting a signal using a first antenna associated with said first integrated circuit device (citing antenna in FIG. 2); and receiving said signal using a second antenna associated with said second integrated circuit device within said enclosure 12.

The Examiner acknowledges that Metze does not explicitly state that the signal is transmitted using the first antenna in accordance with an ultra wide band wireless standard. The Examiner asserts, however, that it would be obvious to include different short-range standards into the system of Metze. The Examiner notes that Metze suggests that wide bandwidth MIMICs operating at well above 100 GHz are commercially available (citing col. 3, lines 62-64). "High

bandwidth" or "wide bandwidth" and "*ultra wide bandwidth," however, are* ***not*** *technically equivalent*, as would be well understood by a person of ordinary skill in the art. While Metze may teach that "other frequencies may be utilized and still fall within the standard I.E.E.E. definition of 'millimeter-wave' for purposes of this invention," Metze does ***not*** disclose or suggest "*ultra wide bandwidth*," as defined in the art.

Metze is clearly limited to transmission and reception over *discrete* carrier frequencies. See, for example, the discussion at col. 4, lines 48-53, where it is noted that if the MIMIC 16 labeled T1/R1 (in FIG. 1) transmits at (discrete) frequency f2 and receives at (discrete) frequency f1 and the MIMIC 16 labeled T2/R2 transmits at (discrete) frequency f1 and receives at (discrete) frequency f2, data can be readily transmitted between the CPUs 14 labeled A1 and A2.

Ultra wide band communications, on the other hand, is a *wideband* wireless technology, rather than a *narrowband* technology, that depends on encoding the information on a number of narrow carrier frequencies. Using multiple frequency bands, the transmitted information is effectively spread across a wide range of frequencies. See, e.g., http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ultra_wideband.

As discussed in http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ultra_wideband, "a significant difference between traditional radio transmissions and UWB radio transmissions is that traditional transmissions transmit information by varying the power/frequency/and or phase in distinct and controlled frequencies while *UWB transmissions transmit information by generating radio energy at specific times with a broad frequency range.*" (Emphasis added.) Thus, *by definition*, UWB transmissions *generate radio energy at specific times with a broad frequency range, i.e., the transmitted information is effectively spread across a wide range of frequencies.*

This was asserted in Applicant's prior response, but not addressed at all by the Examiner in the present Office Action.

Metze's teaching of the use of *discrete* carrier frequencies, such as f1 and f2, for transmission and reception between two integrated circuits ***teaches away*** from the present invention. Thus, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not even look to Larrick et al. in the

manner suggested by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for at least the reason that there exists no motivation to combine the references. M.P.E.P. §2143.

Thus, Metze and Larrick et al., alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest transmitting a signal using a first antenna associated with said first integrated circuit device in accordance with an ultra wide band wireless standard, as required by independent claim 1, does not disclose or suggest transmitting a signal using an antenna associated with said integrated circuit device in accordance with an ultra wide band wireless standard to a second integrated circuit device within said enclosure, as required by independent claim 14, and does not disclose or suggest at least one circuit for transmitting a signal in accordance with an ultra wide band wireless standard, as required by independent claim 17, as amended.

Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1, 14 and 17

Dependent Claims

Claims 2-10, 15-16, and 18-21 are dependent on independent claims 1, 14 and 17, respectively, and are therefore patentably distinguished over Metze, Larrick et al., Cheung et al., Nozawa et al. and Ghaem, alone or in any combination, because of their dependency from independent claims 1, 14 and 17 for the reasons set forth above, as well as other elements these claims add in combination to their base claim.

All of the pending claims, i.e., claims 1-10 and 14-21, are in condition for allowance and such favorable action is earnestly solicited.

If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Examiner's attention to this matter is appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 13, 2007

Kevin M. Mason
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 36,597
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
1300 Post Road, Suite 205
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 255-6560